

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance.

Claims 2-4, 6-8 and 10 and amended claims 1, 5 and 9 are in this application.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rutkowski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,198,442) in view of Vannatta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,977,916).

Amended independent claim 1 now recites in part:

“An antenna apparatus...comprising...a pair of antennas...**each antenna in the one pair being operable at a time which is independent of the other ...**”
(Underlining and bold added for emphasis.)

For at least the reasons herein below described, it is respectfully submitted that Rutkowski (hereinafter, merely “Rutkowski”) and Vannatta (hereinafter, merely “Vannatta”) as applied by the Examiner do not disclose the above-mentioned feature of amended independent claim 1.

In explaining the above 103(a) rejection with regard to claim 1, the Examiner acknowledged that Rutkowski does not teach “antennas being one of a pair of dipole antenna, loop antennas, plane inverted F pattern antennas and inverted L pattern antennas.” In an attempt to overcome this deficiency, the Examiner apparently relies on Vannatta to teach such feature. In particular, the Examiner appears to rely on figure 6 and column 5, line 8 of Vannatta to disclose “...inverted F pattern antennas and inverted L pattern antennas...”

Vannatta discloses a pair of antennas operable at the same time while they are being driven by different phase radio frequency signals. On the other hand, amended independent claim 1 specifically states that each antenna in the pair is “operable at a time which is independent of the other.”

Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Rutkowski and Vannatta.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to amended independent claim 1, amended independent claims 5 and 9 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Rutkowski and Vannatta.

Claims 2-4, 6-8 and 10 are dependent from one of amended independent claims 1, 5 and 9, and due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Rutkowski and Vannatta for at least the reasons previously described.

Applicants therefore, respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference or references, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-10 and the allowance of this application with claims 1-10 are respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith
to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By:



Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800